

Application No. 10/604,368  
Technology Center 1762  
Amendment dated January 18, 2007  
Reply to Office Action dated October 18, 2006

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
JAN 18 2007

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached one (1) sheet of drawings includes changes to Figure 1.

This sheet, which includes Figures 1-3 only, replaces the original drawing sheet that also included Figures 1-3 only. In Figure 1, the section line labeled 2-2 has been eliminated.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet (1)

Application No. 10/604,368  
Technology Center 1762  
Amendment dated January 18, 2007  
Reply to Office Action dated October 18, 2006

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
JAN 18 2007

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-20 of the above-identified US Patent Application, with the result that the Examiner requested updating of the status of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/248,056 to Spitsberg et al., objected to the drawings, rejected claims 1-6 and 10 under 35 USC §103, allowed claims 12-20, and deemed claims 7-9 and 11 (which depend from claim 1) to recite allowable subject matter. In response, Applicants have amended the specification, drawings, and claims as set forth above. More particularly:

The specification has been amended to update the status of Spitsberg et al., which issued as U.S. Patent No. 7,150,922 after the filing of the present application.

In amended Figure 1, the section line 2-2, which was the basis for the objection to the drawings, has been omitted.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of its dependent claim 7, pursuant to the Examiner's conclusion that claim 7 recites allowable subject matter. As such, independent claim 1 and claims depending therefrom are believed to be allowable over the prior art of record.

Dependent claim 8 has been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of its base claim 1, pursuant to the Examiner's conclusion

Application No. 10/604,368  
Technology Center 1762  
Amendment dated January 18, 2007  
Reply to Office Action dated October 18, 2006

that claim 8 recites allowable subject matter. As such, claim 8 and its dependent claim 9 are believed to be allowable over the prior art of record.

Dependent claim 11 has been rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of its base claim 1 and intervening claim 10, pursuant to the Examiner's conclusion that claim 11 recites allowable subject matter. As such, claim 11 is believed to be allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of its limitations being incorporated into its parent claim 1, and in view of dependent claim 8 being rewritten in independent form, claim 7 has been amended to recite the limitation originally recited in dependent claim 8.

Applicants believe that the above amendments do not present new matter. Instead, the amendments are strictly limited to amending the claims so that each independent claim recites limitations cited by the Examiner as being allowable subject matter. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections under 35 USC §103.

Application No. 10/604,368  
Technology Center 1762  
Amendment dated January 18, 2007  
Reply to Office Action dated October 18, 2006

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
JAN 18 2007

**Closing**

Should the Examiner have any questions with respect to any matter now of record, Applicants' representative may be reached at (219) 462-4999.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Domenica N.S. Hartman  
Reg. No. 32,701

January 18, 2007  
Hartman & Hartman, P.C.  
Valparaiso, Indiana 46383  
TEL.: (219) 462-4999  
FAX: (219) 464-1166

Attachment: Replacement Drawing Sheet